UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,543	02/20/2004	Stephen Cutler	CUTCP0103US	7433

23908   7590   02/25/2008
RENNER OTTO BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP
1621 EUCLID AVENUE
NINETEENTH FLOOR
CLEVELAND, OH 44115

EXAMINER
ORR, HENRY W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 February 2004*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-72* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
7)☒ Claim(s) *1-72* is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *3/19/2004*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to application communication filed on 2/20/2004.

2.   Claims 1-72 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 29, 31, 33, 37, 65, 67 and 69 are

independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

3.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 3/19/2004 is in

compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the examiner is

considering the information disclosure statement.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5.   Claims 1, 2, 6-9, 12, 13, 18-24, 29-38, 42-45, 48, 49, 54-60 and 65-72 are

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Czerwinski et al.

(hereinafter "Czerwinski"), U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0066414 A1.

Claim 1:

Czerwinski teaches **a computer application workspace generation and navigation tool embodied on a computer-readable medium, comprising code that generates an application workspace for an associated main computer application, the application workspace comprised of a plurality of screens, each screen having dimensions that are generally coextensive with a viewable area defined by the main computer application** (see par. 3, par. 8, par. 24, par. 35).

Claim 2:

Czerwinski teaches **code that logically associates a plurality of sub-application windows with respective locations of the application workspace, the sub-application windows for displaying content of at least one sub-application that is associated with the main computer application**(see par. 36, par. 39).

Claim 6:

Czerwinski teaches **code that stores an arrangement of sub-application windows disposed within the application workspace** (see abstract, par. 46, Figure 8).

Claim 7:

Czerwinski teaches **code that retrieves the stored arrangement of sub-application windows** (see abstract, par. 46, Figure 8).

Claim 8:

Czerwinski teaches **code that stores a layout of the application workspace including a number and arrangement of screens and relative location of each sub-application window** (see abstract, par. 35, par. 46).

Claim 9:

Czerwinski teaches **code that retrieves the stored layout** (see abstract, par. 35, par. 46).

Claim 12:

Czerwinski teaches **code that, upon initiation of one of the sub-application windows, logically associates the sub-application window with a location of the application workspace identified by user action** (see par. 39).

Claim 13:

Czerwinski teaches **code to provide the user with a user moveable placement means, wherein the location of the application workspace identified by user action corresponds to a location of the placement means relative to the application workspace** (see par. 46).

Claim 18:

Czerwinski teaches **code that generates a navigation box** (e.g. preview

screen) **that includes a representation of each screen** (see par. 35, par. 46).

Claim 19:

Czerwinski teaches **wherein the screen representations are arranged to have**

a topography corresponding to a topography of the screens (see par. 35, par. 46).

Claim 20:

Czerwinski teaches **code that, in response to user selection of one of the**

screen representations in the navigation box, displays the corresponding screen

in the viewable area defined by the main computer application (see par. 35, par.

41-42, par. 46).

Claim 21:

Czerwinski teaches **code that logically associates a plurality of sub-**

application windows with respective locations of the application workspace, the

sub-application windows for displaying content of at least one sub-application

that is associated with the main computer application (see par. 36, par. 39).

Claim 22:

Czerwinski teaches **code that logically associates each sub-application window with a screen in which a majority of the sub-application window is disposed and code that displays a representation of each sub-application window in association with the representation of the logically associated screen** (see par. 35-36, par. 39).

Claim 23:

Czerwinski teaches **code that moves a user selected sub-application window from a logically associated screen to another screen in response to user initiated movement of the corresponding representation of the sub-application window in the navigation box** (see par. 35, par. 46).

Claim 24:

Czerwinski teaches **code that displays information relating to one of the sub-application windows in response to user action in connection with the representation of the one of the sub-application windows in the navigation box application** (see par. 41-42, par. 46).

Claim 29:

Czerwinski teaches **a computer application workspace generation and navigation tool embodied on a computer-readable medium, comprising: code that**

generates an application workspace for an associated main computer

application; (see par. 3, par. 8, par. 24, Figure 10)

code that logically associates a plurality of sub-application windows with

respective locations of the application workspace, the sub-application windows

for displaying content of at least one sub-application that is associated with the

main computer application; (see par. 36, par. 39)

and code that stores the logical associations of the at least one sub-

application window as an application workspace arrangement (see abstract, par.

46, Figure 8).

Claim 30:

Czerwinski teaches code that retrieves the stored application workspace

arrangement (see abstract, par. 46, Figure 8).

Claim 31:

Czerwinski teaches a computer application workspace generation and

navigation tool embodied on a computer-readable medium, comprising: code that

generates an application workspace for an associated main computer

application; (see par. 3, par. 8, par. 24, Figure 10)

code that logically associates a plurality of sub-application windows with

respective locations of the application workspace, the sub-application windows

for displaying content of at least one sub-application that is associated with the

main computer application; (see par. 36, par. 39)

and code that stores a layout of the application workspace including a

number and arrangement of screens that define the application workspace and

relative location of each sub-application window within the application workspace

(see abstract, par. 35, par. 46).

Claim 32:

Czerwinski teaches **code that retrieves the layout** (see abstract, par. 35, par.

46).

Claim 33:

Czerwinski teaches **a computer application workspace generation and**

navigation tool embodied on a computer-readable medium, comprising: code that

generates a workspace for at least one of a computer application and an

operating system desktop; (see par. 3, par. 8, par. 24, Figure 10)

and **code that, upon initiation of a window, logically associates the window**

with a location of the workspace identified by user action (see par. 39, par. 47).

Claim 34:

Czerwinski teaches **code to provide the user with a user moveable**

placement means, wherein the location of the workspace identified by user action

corresponds to a location of the placement means relative to the workspace (see

par. 46-47).

Claim 35:

Czerwinski teaches **wherein the placement means is a placement pointer**

having a position that defines the location of the workspace identified by user

action (see par. 46-47).

Claim 36:

Czerwinski teaches **wherein the placement means is a placement tool for**

marking the location of the workspace identified by user action (see par. 46-47).

Claims 37 and 38:

Claims 37 and 38 are method claims and are substantially encompassed in

manufacture claims 1 and 2 respectively; therefore the method claims are rejected

under the same rationale as manufacture claims 1 and 2 above.

Claims 42 and 43:

Claims 42 and 43 are method claims and are substantially encompassed in

manufacture claims 6 and 7 respectively; therefore the method claims are rejected

under the same rationale as manufacture claims 6 and 7 above.

Claims 44 and 45:

Claims 44 and 45 are method claims and are substantially encompassed in

manufacture claims 8 and 9 respectively; therefore the method claims are rejected

under the same rationale as manufacture claims 8 and 9 above.

Claims 48 and 49:

Claims 48 and 49 are method claims and are substantially encompassed in

manufacture claims 12 and 13 respectively; therefore the method claims are rejected

under the same rationale as manufacture claims 12 and 13 above.

Claim 54:

Claim 54 is a method claim and is substantially encompassed in manufacture

claim 18; therefore the method claim is rejected under the same rationale as

manufacture claim 18 above.

Claim 55:

Claim 55 is a method claim and is substantially encompassed in manufacture

claim 19; therefore the method claim is rejected under the same rationale as

manufacture claim 19 above.

Claim 56:

Claim 56 is a method claim and is substantially encompassed in manufacture

claim 20; therefore the method claim is rejected under the same rationale as

manufacture claim 20 above.

Claims 57-60:

Claims 57-60 are method claims and are substantially encompassed in

manufacture claims 21-24 respectively; therefore the method claims are rejected under

the same rationale as manufacture claims 21-24 above.

Claims 65 and 66:

Claims 65 and 66 are method claims and are substantially encompassed in

manufacture claims 29 and 30 respectively; therefore the method claims are rejected

under the same rationale as manufacture claims 29 and 30 above.

Claims 67 and 68:

Claims 67 and 68 are method claims and are substantially encompassed in

manufacture claims 31 and 32 respectively; therefore the method claims are rejected

under the same rationale as manufacture claims 31 and 32 above.

Claims 69-72:

Claims 69-72 are method claims and are substantially encompassed in manufacture claims 33-36 respectively; therefore the method claims are rejected under the same rationale as manufacture claims 33-36 above.

6.   **Claims 1-5, 10, 11, 14-17, 25-28, 37-41, 46, 47, 50-53 and 61-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Anderson et al. (hereinafter "Anderson"), U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0189597 A1.**

Claim 1:

Anderson teaches **a computer application workspace generation and navigation tool embodied on a computer-readable medium, comprising code that generates an application workspace for an associated main computer application, the application workspace comprised of a plurality of screens, each screen having dimensions that are generally coextensive with a viewable area defined by the main computer application** (see abstract, par. 3, par. 8-9, Figures 2 and 5).

Claim 2:

Anderson teaches **code that logically associates a plurality of sub-application windows with respective locations of the application workspace, the sub-application windows for displaying content of at least one sub-application that is associated with the main computer application** (see abstract, par. 3, par. 8-9).

Claim 3:

Anderson teaches **code that increases the number of screens if, by user action, one of the sub-application windows is moved to a new location outside dimensions of the application workspace** (see par. 35).

Claim 4:

Anderson teaches **code that increases the number of screens adds screens in a number that is in excess of that needed to accommodate the new location of the sub-application window** (see par. 34).

Claim 5:

Anderson teaches **code that logically associates each sub-application window with a screen in which a majority of the sub-application window is disposed** (see par. 40).

Claim 10:

Anderson teaches **code that scales the application workspace and sub-application windows such that each screen has a dimension smaller than the viewable area** (see par. 8).

Claim 11:

    Anderson teaches **code that scales the application workspace and sub-**

application windows such that each screen has a dimension larger than the

viewable area (see par. 10, par. 36).

Claim 14:

    Anderson teaches **wherein the screens are contiguously arranged in a**

matrix (see par. 40, Figure 7).

Claim 15:

    Anderson teaches **wherein the screens are arranged contiguously such that**

the application workspace is continuous (see par. 40, Figure 7).

Claim 16:

    Anderson teaches **code that increases the number of screens and a**

corresponding dimension of the application workspace in accordance with a user

action (see par. 35).

Claim 17:

    Anderson teaches **code that decreases the number of screens and a**

corresponding dimension of the application workspace in accordance with a user

action (see par. 10, par. 36).

Claim 25:

Anderson teaches **code that provides a drop down menu from which a user can select one of the plurality of screens for display in the viewable area defined by the main computer application** (see par. 33). Examiner interprets the taskbar to anticipate the drop down menu because taskbar is capable of performing the limitations of the drop down menu as recited in claim 25.

Claim 26:

Anderson teaches **code that generates the application workspace generates a plurality of application workspaces for the main computer application** (see abstract).

Claim 27:

Anderson teaches **wherein each screen is associated with a unique identifying feature** (see par. 10).

Claim 28

Anderson teaches **wherein the unique identifying feature is selected from a background color, a background pattern and a combination thereof** (see par. 10).

Claims 37 and 38:

Claims 37 and 38 are method claims and are substantially encompassed in

manufacture claims 1 and 2 respectively; therefore the method claims are rejected

under the same rationale as manufacture claims 1 and 2 above.

Claims 39 and 40:

Claims 39 and 40 are method claims and are substantially encompassed in

manufacture claims 3 and 4 respectively; therefore the method claims are rejected

under the same rationale as manufacture claims 3 and 4 above.

Claim 41:

Claim 41 is a method claim and is substantially encompassed in manufacture

claim 5; therefore the method claim is rejected under the same rationale as manufacture

claim 5 above.

Claims 46 and 47:

Claims 46 and 47 are method claims and are substantially encompassed in

manufacture claims 9 and 10 respectively; therefore the method claims are rejected

under the same rationale as manufacture claims 9 and 10 above.

Claims 50-53:

Claims 50-53 are method claims and are substantially encompassed in

manufacture claims 14-17 respectively; therefore the method claims are rejected under

the same rationale as manufacture claims 14-17 above.

Claims 61-64:

Claims 61-64 are method claims and are substantially encompassed in

manufacture claims 25-28 respectively; therefore the method claims are rejected under

the same rationale as manufacture claims 25-28 above.

Conclusion

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Henry Orr whose telephone number is (571) 270 1308.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8 to 4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on (571) 272-4137. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

2/15/2008
HO

/Doug Hutton/
Doug Hutton
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100